

**Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**  
**Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA)**

**Report Summary: No On-Site Visit**

**MSIP Year: 2001-2002**

Total Number of Surveys:	Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC)			
Role of Person completing this survey:	Heart of Missouri-Columbia:	3	South Central Missouri:	1
Special Education Contact: 16	Southwest Missouri:	2	Southeast Missouri:	0
Superintendent: 2	Kansas City:	2	St. Louis:	1
Principal: 2	Northeast Missouri:	0	Central Missouri:	3
Other: 1	Northwest Missouri:	2		

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<b>A. TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</b>					
1. SEMSA training workshops were helpful.	6	12	3	0	0
2. DESE provided timely and helpful responses to questions.	8	9	2	2	0
3. Compliance List Serv was helpful in answering questions.	2	15	4	0	0
<b>B. WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS</b>					
4. SEMSA instruction guidelines were helpful.	4	12	3	2	0
5. SEMSA instruction guidelines were user friendly.	2	15	3	1	0
<b>C. SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS</b>					
6. Data required to complete the self-monitoring review was easily accessible.	2	16	1	2	0
7. Amount of time required to complete the review was reasonable.	1	5	5	6	4
8. Electronic submission of data is an efficient way to send SEMSA data to DESE.	10	5	6	0	0
9. SEMSA process increased understanding of compliance requirements for special education.	5	11	3	1	1
10. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess student performance for students w/ disabilities.	3	6	8	3	1
11. SEMSA process has made district/agency more aware of performance of students w/disabilities.	3	12	2	3	1
12. SEMSA process helped accurately evaluate performance of students w/ disabilities.	2	7	3	8	1
13. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess compliance with state/federal regulations.	6	13	2	0	0
14. Time spent on the SEMSA process was beneficial.	3	9	8	0	1
<b>D. FINAL REPORT AND LETTER</b>					
15. Received final monitoring report/letter in reasonable length of time.	2	7	0	5	7
16. Final report/letter were user friendly.	5	10	1	2	3
<b>E. CORRECTIVE ACTION/IMPROVEMENT PLANNING</b>					
17. District/agency is aware of its areas of non-compliance.	8	12	1	0	0
18. District/agency is aware of what it needs to do to correct any areas of non-compliance.	6	13	1	1	1
<b>F. ON-SITE PREPARATION AND VISIT</b>					
19. Preparation for the on-site monitoring accomplished in reasonable amount of time.	0	0	0	0	0
20. On-site monitoring was beneficial.	0	0	0	0	0
21. On-site monitoring conducted in an efficient and effective manner.	0	0	0	0	0
22. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were knowledgeable.	1	0	0	0	0
23. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were professional.	0	0	0	0	0
24. DESE staff conducting the on-site monitoring were helpful.	0	0	0	0	0

25. How many staff were involved in the SEMSA self-monitoring review process?

Special Educators: 323      Administrators: 194      Support Staff: 65      Others: 3

26. How many total hours did it take to complete the SEMSA Review and Reporting:

Less than 20 hours: 1      21 to 30 hours: 4      31 to 40 hours: 7      More than 40 hours: 8

27. Did staff request assistance from a DESE special education Compliance supervisor during the SEMSA process?

Yes 16      No 4

*Questions 28-31 are addressed on a separate report.*